

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 1, 1854.

NO. 3.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY,

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS.—One Dollar for the Year;

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

OBEDIENCE TO GOD.

BY THE EDITOR.

[Concluded from page 4]

II. THE GROUND OF THEIR CONFIDENCE?

Why did these men continue steadfast under such circumstances?

1. *The word, or Law of God was their supreme rule of action.*

No matter what laws are issued by civil or ecclesiastical rulers, if those laws or decrees contravene the authority of God, no man must obey them, whatever hazard he may run. No plea of "obedience to rulers" will avail any one here; and no man can obey such laws, or decrees, without the guilt of renouncing his allegiance to God. The requirement to obey rulers, civil or ecclesiastical, is based on the ground that they "who rule over men *rule in the fear of God.*" God is the power from which they have received their authority to rule, or else they are *usurpers*. If they have received authority from God to rule, then they are bound to rule according to the *Constitution* God has given for their guide: that *Constitution* is the Bible, or Scriptures of Truth. If, then, any body of rulers do not rule *constitutionally*, or according to the truth of God, their laws and decrees, which are not in harmony with God's law, are null and void. The man who professes allegiance to God and yet obeys such laws, or edicts, is but a hypocritical pretender: he is a rebel against God. God's authority must be supreme with us, or *He is not our God.*

Let us not be misunderstood. We are not teaching resistance by *physical force*: no; but there must not be even a *seeming* obedience to such laws; yet we can endure whatever *penalty* such wicked civil or ecclesiastical despots shall inflict upon us for our choosing to "*obey God rather than men.*" The penalty we can endure without crime on our part; but obey we cannot without the highest sin.

But "this principle," says one, "would overturn government, and bring the laws into contempt." So Nebuchadnezzar thought, and proceeded to act accordingly; but nevertheless the servants of God were unmoved in their purpose

to obey God at all hazards; and calmly told the king they would not obey him: the law of their God, to them, was *above* that of the monarch of Babylon: and so it must be to every man, or he is an *idolater*. No human law can bind any man, when such law is clearly opposed to the requirements of God. On this ground stood the three Hebrews. Love to God and trust in him was the ground of their refusal to obey the law of that land, on the occasion under consideration.

The correctness of the principle can be seen by a simple illustration. Suppose a law is enacted which requires that any man meeting another who has but one eye, or one leg, shall smite him to the earth, or be subjected to fine and imprisonment. Could we *obey* such law and be Christians? Certainly not. We could *suffer* the penalty without physical resistance. Let civil and ecclesiastical invaders of God's truth and authority know that their commands, so far as they contravene the commands of God, cannot and will not be obeyed by the servants of God. Thus did the men before us.

2. *A Clear Conscience* was another ground of confidence to these Hebrews. "Our God whom *we serve*," is their language. A good conscience makes a man strong. But such a conscience can only exist when men are governed by the principles of truth, and not by expediency. An expediency man can always find an excuse for violating the demands of truth upon his conscience; and thus he weakens and destroys the voice of conscience, and comes to be incapable of withstanding any temptation to sin. These Hebrews could say, firmly, "*we serve God*;" their consciences did not upbraid them with disregarding His authority. Hence they are strong on the occasion. When men uniformly regard the requirements of God they will have the assurance of His protection and favor, which enables them to suffer for His name.

3. *The Goodness and Mercy of God* formed another link in the chain which led them to confide in Him. "*He will deliver us.*" God is good and will not suffer his faithful ones to be tried above that they are able to bear. There is no ground for supposing that these men had any assurance of *such* a deliverance as they received; but their general knowledge of God's goodness and mercy led them to confide in Him without wavering. "God *will* deliver me;" if not by preserving life now, yet he will deliver me from sin, and hence from *ultimate death*—the wages of sin—is a truth which is based on His mercy and goodness, and forms a ground of confidence in the severest trials. Let these traits of His character ever live in the mind of the ser-

vant of God, and they will make him strong to endure trial.

4. *The Power of God* is another source of confidence to these men. "*Our God is able,*" is their noble reply to the king, when he tauntingly asked—"Who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands?" If God is good and merciful, is He as *able* as He is good? *Yes*: What His goodness and mercy prompts Him to do, His *power* can accomplish; so that His servants have nothing to fear in this respect. These men could call to mind the power of God as exhibited to their nation in their deliverance out of Egypt—His miracles for the people in the wilderness—and all the various wonders He had wrought for His people in all previous time; and, inspired with the consideration of the facts, could say, "*Our God is able* to deliver us." Happy those who keep alive in their minds the power of that Being who made heaven and earth; for it will make them strong to endure trial in spite of all apparent dangers and threats. On the rock of God's almighty power can we safely rest, while in the path of obedience to His will. These Hebrews found it a rock of strength in their time of need, and rested upon it.

5. *The Promise of God*, tho' not expressed in their reply to the king, doubtless, was in their mind. They might call to mind the promise of God—"When thou walkest through the fire thou shalt not be burned: neither shall the flame kindle upon thee;" Isaiah 43: 2. Though this promise might not have been designed to be understood literally, yet, it could not fail to afford support in the hour of such trial as that these Hebrews were now called to. Happy is the man whose mind is stored with such supports as the promises of God afford.

These men rush not to scenes of danger uncalled of God; nor do they refuse to obey the king of Babylon so long as his laws and commands do not conflict with those of God. At the *command* of the king they come to the dedication of the *image*; for God had never commanded them not to *stand* before an image: so they obey the king up to the utmost limit they were permitted by their allegiance to the God of heaven; but when the king goes a step further, and commands to "*bow down*" to his image, these men refuse; because, *that* God, had *forbidden*. Now their regard for God's authority, *as supreme*, is to be tested; and it is found to endure the trial—they will not *bow down* whoever else may do so, or whatever reproach and suffering may be heaped upon them for their non-compliance. They are firm as the rock of God's word upon which they stand. What objects of contempt for the moment—what wonder and amazement is caused by their supposed folly. This leads us to notice—

III. THE CONSEQUENCES OF THEIR FIRMNESS.

1. *Their enemies were enraged and the hostility increased.* "Nebuchadnezzar was full of fury, and the form of his visage was changed against" these men. "*Heat up the furnace,*" he

cries, "one seven times more than it was" usual to be heated."

"What an excitement these men have made!" "How they have disturbed the *peace* of the Church, or State!" "Strange they should be so wilful and obstinate!" Thus men talk, who regard their own superstitions, or popular favor, more than the authority of God. They know nothing of being governed by that authority; and they are astonished that any one else should be. They attribute it to obstinacy, or an insane spirit, because they are ignorant of the power of supreme respect for God's authority.

The self-willed *image* worshippers were enraged because their will was not regarded above the will of God. So it usually is. Civil and ecclesiastical rulers too often fancy they are to be obeyed, and their will not to be opposed, merely because they have become intoxicated with power; and they construe any dissent from their decrees into rebellion against God; forgetting that all men have the right to try their decrees by the unerring rule God has given. But opposition to their will usually raises their *fury* to a flame: so it was anciently; and so it is still. The three Hebrews are, however, unmoved by the tempest that howls around them: their position is taken and they cannot be moved. This leads us to notice another consequence of their firmness; *viz*:

2. *God is glorified in the face of His enemies:* He has an opportunity to manifest His power. Had these men been your time-serving sycophants, who can put God, conscience, and truth, all aside, through fear of displeasing a mortal, or for some more censurable reason, then would the power of God been held in contempt by all the image worshippers assembled on that occasion. But these Hebrews were firm in their purpose to obey God, in face of the greatest danger, and when the most ignominious death appeared before them. Their enemies are terribly aroused, and "the most mighty men in the army" of the king seize them, and bind them in such haste that neither their coats, hats, or other clothing are removed; but they were hurried into the "fiery furnace," and "fell down bound" therein. Filled with haughty exultation, the king and his cringing sycophants, were doubtless ready to conclude they would make it manifest that their *will* was not to be resisted: and that these Hebrews would lose their "*hot zeal*" for their God when the "fiery furnace" was about to receive them. But, look again! What do we see? Nebuchadnezzar's "mighty men," who had performed the office of the tyrant's will, lie *slain* before the "fiery furnace." Hot, indeed, the king had made it; too hot for his own time-serving mighty ones; for they fall dead by the flames they have kindled at his will; yet, God's *obedient ones* are seen "*walking loose* in the midst of the fire!" Surely they must be 'harm'd! Yes, if burning off the cords that bound them was harm; for they are "*loose*." All that civil or ecclesiastical despots can ever do, as to the *ultimate* event, against those who from principle stand firm for the su-

preme authority of God, is but to give them greater enlargement; and such despots are but the losers in the end by their denial of that supreme authority. What do I see! cries out the haughty tyrant—"Did not we cast three men bound into the midst of the fire? Lo, I see *four men* loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt." True, haughty tyrant—prototype of all other tyrants, whether civil or ecclesiastical—true, they are loose, and unharmed! Do you know now "Who is that God that can deliver out of" your "hands?" You would not have known, had these Hebrews been like the time-servers with which our land and world abounds. But now God is honored—His name magnified—the haughty tyrant humbled and his *image*—his *golden image*—brought into contempt. What do we see? Where is that prostrate company—so scrupulously bent on not "disturbing the peace," as to sacrifice conscience and principle, to be in harmony with "*the church*," or State! Where are they now? All gazing into the fiery furnace, filled with astonishment at what the God of the Hebrews had wrought! Where now is the great and *golden image*! Look at it, as it stands in "the plain of Dura!" Has it any admirers? No: *not one*. All have forsaken it. Not one so poor or mean, in all the vast crowd, as to pay it the least respect, or to be found kneeling before it? No: it has sunk into a meanness that nothing can equal but the time-servers of the present age. What has called off attention from it? Ah, the faithful servants of the God of the Bible have given their Sovereign an opportunity to manifest His power, and that power has shown the contemptible and wicked character of all human policy that shrinks from the path of uniform obedience to the known will of God. Such a result, to God's honor, came from the firm principle in the breasts of His servants, which no flatteries, threats, or other terrible consequences, real or imaginary, could shake. And that manifestation of God's goodness, mercy, and *power*, has sustained many a faithful heart under the trials and temptations to which the servants of the Most High God have, more or less, been subject in all periods since.

We come to notice,

3. *These Hebrews have an increase of joy and confidence.* This is a natural result; or a *gracious* one, if the phrase suits better. This joy and confidence time-servers are strangers to; because such characters never can have a good conscience. If every spark of light and truth has not become extinct in such, they cannot but feel that they have sacrificed truth and righteousness to expediency; that has been their "*golden image*," to which they have fallen down, despite the plain commands of God their Maker. Such men never can know the bliss of the three Hebrews; who, acknowledging God as Supreme, carried out their principles in *practical life*; and God honored them, and gave them such demonstration of His love and care as could not fail to fill them with joy unspeakable

and full of glory; all of which they would have come short of had they given way under the pressure of circumstances. Henceforth, *the experience* of the past is added to all other considerations to comfort their minds in the firm obedience to their God and attachment to His service.

4. *Their enemies were put to silence.* Most men, who live in the sacrifice of principle to expediency, suppose they gain by such a course. But, gain or lose, at present, such a course must ultimately in crushing their manhood, as well as their religion; while the opposite cause exalts their manhood, and always improves their moral character, as well as ultimately silencing their enemies. This was peculiarly so in the case under consideration. In the result, the proud monarch, who had defied the God of these men (verse 15) was forced to acknowledge that "no other God can deliver after this sort;" and a royal decree is drawn forth, from Nebuchadnezzar, that no man, in all his vast dominions, should "speak anything amiss against the God of Shadrack, Meshack, and Abednego." This decree must be carried home by those time-serving princes, governors, captains, judges, &c., who had come to do homage to the "*golden image*," and who had fallen down thereto; but are now compelled to return home, not with the praise of the image, but with the astonishing intelligence that the God of heaven is above all other gods, and that His servants—faithful to His commands—are henceforth to have full liberty to honor Him, not only unmolested, but none are to speak anything against Him. Thus were the contemners of Israel's God silenced by the faithful obedience of His servants, and the manifestation of His power; for which their obedience gave occasion.

IMPROVEMENT.—1. *We learn the blessedness of those who faithfully serve God.* Reflection on the bliss or joy these men must have experienced, under all the circumstances over which they were enabled to triumph, will convince any mind that the consideration, that they were kept from dishonoring God in the hour of trial, and that their firmness was made the occasion of a richer and more glorious display of the excellency and power of the God they loved, and the spread of His fame abroad, must have imparted a blessedness to them which would prove lasting as life itself. Such a bliss time-servers fail to secure, and sometimes die of mortification and disappointment.

2. *We learn that there is no necessity for abandoning right principles, or for complying with wicked customs.* After the considerations already set before us, in contemplating this subject, we have no need to enlarge on this reflection; and we name it only to impress the truth on the mind. May it never be obliterated therefrom.

3. *We learn that God can and does get honor to Himself by His faithful people in spite of their enemies.*

4. *We learn that God will not suffer those who adhere to right principles or to His truth,*

to be tried above what they are able to bear, but will now or ultimately deliver them.

5. *We see the honor that God puts upon His faithful servants.*

6. *Let us learn to OBEY God under ALL CIRCUMSTANCES, and at ALL TIMES.* No plea can ever answer for an opposite course; and we can have no excuse, in view of this subject, for concealing an attachment to God's truth and authority. Openly, fearlessly, yet calmly, let us maintain both: and remember, Jesus hath said, "Whoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Mark 8: 38. Solemn words these. May we heed the warning.

IMMORTAL-SOULISTS IN TROUBLE.—We clip the following *Criticism on Hymns and Psalms* from the *Presbyterian Herald*, Louisville, Ky.; DR. HILL editor. He says:

The Due West Telescope, the organ of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, quotes our criticism upon the phrase sometimes applied to departed Christians, in obituary notices, that "*they are no more*," and then adds a similar criticism upon one of the hymns in the General Assembly's collection. In reference to our remark the editor says:

"That is very well said, Dr. Hill. But what better is the sentiment of hymn 610 in the collection issued by your Board, and approved by your Assembly, and which, if we may judge from the frequency of its use, is among the most popular in the collection? To show that it is a favorite, it is only necessary to say that it commences: 'Life is the time to serve the Lord,' &c. We quote the third, fourth and sixth verses, and italicise the words and phrases that excite the 'wonder' of a *psalm singer* about as much as would the expression, Mr. A. B. is no more.' Will you please explain for our satisfaction the words in italics, and show their consistency with the doctrines known as the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and a future general judgment? The verses are:

3 The living know that they must die,
But all the dead *forgotten lie*;
Their memory and their sense are gone,
Alike unknowing and unknown.

4 *Their hatred and their love are lost,*
Their envy buried in the dust;
They have no share in all that's done
Beneath the circuit of the sun.

6 There are no acts of pardon past
In the cold grave to which we haste;
But darkness, death and long despair
Reign in eternal silence there."

With all due deference we must be allowed to express the opinion that our esteemed brother has been looking into our hymn book with green spectacles astride his nose. His zeal for Rouse's version has blinded his vision we fear.

If he will turn to the ninth chapter of Ecclesiastes he will there find almost the identical expressions which he has italicised as objectionable in the hymn. Indeed the 610th hymn is a sort of running paraphrase on the verses we quote below: "For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know *not anything*; neither have they any more a reward; *for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in any thing that is done under the sun.*" "For there is no work nor device nor knowledge nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest." In his own favorite version of the Psalms he will find expressions very similar to those he objects to. For example in the 6th Psalm, we have such verses as these:

"Because those that deceased are
Of thee shall no remembrance have,
And who is he that will to thee
Give praises lying in the grave?"

Or again:

"Because of thee in death there shall
No more remembrance be,
Of those that in the grave do lie,
Who shall give thanks to thee?"

Now we take it for granted that our esteemed brother frequently sings these verses very devoutly in the worship of the sanctuary. And yet, how he can consistently do so, and then turn round and reproach his General Assembly brethren for singing their favorite hymn which contains the same sentiment, couched almost in the very words of Scripture, and in far better rhythm and measure, in our poor judgment, than Rouse has expressed it, we cannot clearly see. If we take the term *grave* in the sixth verse of the General Assembly's hymn literally, the lines may be somewhat objectionable; but we presume that it is meant to include, as it sometimes does in Scripture, the invisible world, the place of departed spirits, as well as bodies. In that sense it is literally true, that "darkness, death and long despair reign in eternal silence there." At least it is not harder to be explained consistently with the doctrines of the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the general judgment, than Rouse's expression, "those that deceased are, of thee shall no remembrance have." If our brother will explain that, we will explain, by the same process, the 610th hymn.

DR. HILL does the best he can to wipe off the stain of these Hymns lacking harmony with immortal-soulism and the Bible; how well he succeeds others can judge. The trouble is, neither he, nor his adverse brother critic, can make these Hymns or the Bible to harmonize with the fable of an immortal soul in man. *That is more than both these D.D.'s can do.* Let them try again.

DESTINY OF THE SPIRIT.

"For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other: yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?"—ECCLES. CHAP. 3. 19—21.

To question the immortality and separate state of the human soul, is considered by many, who are not accustomed to reflect on this subject, as endangering the foundations of the Christian faith, and therefore every attempt to show the unscriptural character of this doctrine, is regarded by such persons with pious indignation and alarm. It is passing strange, that what is reputed to be a foundation truth, should never once be recognized in that Book which contains this Divine system of revealed religion! The Christianity of the Churches may need to enrol this philosophical conceit among the things to be believed, but the Christianity of the Bible finds no place for, neither will it endure it. It has been commonly supposed, however, that the last verse of the text which heads this tract teaches at least, the separate state and personality of the human soul, and by contrasting its destiny with that of the spirit of the beast, implies also its immortality. The judgment of the candid reader is invited to the following expository remarks.

In the 19th verse it is stated, both of men and of beasts, "they have all one breath." Now this word *breath* is the same Hebrew word as is twice translated '*spirit*' in the 21st verse. It is proper to ask what reason had our translators to depart from a uniform translation of this word in the three places above mentioned? If they rendered the Hebrew word by the word '*spirit*,' in verse 21, they should have adopted the same word in verse 19, and hence it should have been translated, not "they all have one *breath*;" but "they have all one *spirit*." But the translators were believers in the separate state and immortality of the human soul, and their opinions, therefore, on this subject, could not endure to read, both of man and beast, "yea, they have all one *spirit*;" and thus they preferred the literal rendering of *breath* in this place. And this word *breath* ought to have been preserved throughout the whole connected passage, and not another word, *spirit*, have been employed twice in the 21st verse, as the proper equivalent of the same original word. Thus "Who knoweth the *breath* of man that goeth upward, and the *breath* of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?"

As to the *breath* of man going upward, and the *breath* of the beast going downward to the earth, it is only necessary for its explanation, to remember that it is written, "God *breathed* into man the *breath* of life;" it is not written that God *breathed* into the beast, al-

though of course God kindled in the inferior animals "the breath of life" also. The *breath* of man therefore, may be appropriately said to go upward to God who gave it, without supposing that it is the soul or spirit of man that returns to God in death, as the disembodied human personality.

But this verse must be read in connection with what precedes it, from which it will be evident that no emphasis can be laid upon the correlative words, *upward* and *downward*. So far was Solomon from designing to make a distinction in favor of man, in these verses, that he states in the most decided and emphatic manner, that the *destinies* of man and beast, (in the condition of death) are *identical*. "For that," he says, "*which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath, so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All go unto one place, all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.*"

Now I would ask, if the spirit of man goes *upward*, in the sense commonly understood,—and the spirit of the beast goes *downward*, how could Solomon have written just before, "*that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them?*" How could Solomon have written "*As the one dieth, so dieth the other?*" How, if one goeth '*upward*,' and the other '*downward*,' can '*all go unto one place?*' How could Solomon have affirmed "*so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast?*"

There is no obstacle to the harmonious interpretation of this passage, if we read the 21st verse as it should be read,—substituting the word *breath* for *spirit*. Into man God *breathed* the *breath* of life, and man became a living soul: and in death the *breath* is most appropriately said to return to God who gave it—not as some ethereal substance, instinct with life, and possessed of conscious personality—but in the sense of its being withdrawn by him who imparted it.

It is, moreover, worth remarking that there is a strong reason for concluding that the translators of this passage failed to give the precise meaning which Solomon intended to convey. The oldest version of the Sacred Scriptures, known as the Septuagint or Greek translation of the seventy, and also the Latin Vulgate, and Luther's German Bible, translate this verse as follows: "Who knoweth *whether* the *breath* of man goeth upward, and *whether* the *breath* of the beast goeth downward to the earth?" This translation represents Solomon as challenging the knowledge of men to contradict his assertion that "*all go unto one place, so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast.*" This is probably the meaning of the passage.

It is not generally understood, but it is nevertheless true, that the Bible gives no scientific information concerning the composition of our nature, and that the words *soul* and *body* were

used by the sacred writers in a popular, and not philosophical sense, each word signifying commonly, the whole human nature. Thus, in Numb. 31: 19, we read: "Whosoever hath killed any person;" in the Hebrew it is "Whosoever hath killed any soul;"—meaning of course, 'any person.' Thus, too, Paul wrote, "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God."—Romans 12: 1. Paul could not mean that Christians were to present their mere bodies to God, but *their entire selves*, in a life of consecrated service. The Scriptures speak of man as a compound being, but never use the word *soul* or *spirit* in the modern sense, as being the man, distinct from the body, as if this were but the receptacle of the man;—this notion is purely a human speculation, and is a tradition of the ancient heathen philosophers, adopted, and transmitted to us, by certain Christian teachers, styled 'the Fathers,' subsequent to the Apostolic age. We are not therefore to enquire into the state of the soul or spirit after death, because we know nothing of its distinct existence; the Scriptures tell us of the state of the compound being, called man—"Man giveth up the ghost, (literally expires,) and where is he?" Not where is his soul, but where is he, man? To which, it is replied, "Man (the whole human being) lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, or be raised out of their sleep."—Job 14: 10—12. While dead, man as entirely ceases to be as the beast: and so 'a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast.' But man will rise again. "This," said Jesus Christ, "is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have Everlasting Life: and I WILL RAISE HIM UP AT THE LAST DAY."—John 6: 40.—Rev. J. Pantton Ham.

CLEMENS, ROMANUS, ORIGEN, JUSTIN MARTYR and others, were, before their conversion to Christianity, Platonic philosophers. The speculative opinions which they held concerning the soul as a distinct subsistence they carried with them into the new faith. The importance which they attached to their doctrine of the soul's immortality as an independent being may be seen by the following account which CLEMENS gives of himself: "As such thoughts, then, dwelt in me from my childhood, I resorted to the schools, of the philosophers, hoping to find some certain foundation on which I could repose: and I saw nothing but building up and tearing down of theories,—nothing but endless dispute and contradiction: sometimes, for example, the demonstration triumphed of the soul's immortality, then again, of its mortality. When the former prevailed I rejoiced; when the latter, I was depressed."

"There could not fail to arise, then," writes Neander, "out of this school (the Platonic) itself, an opposition of views: on the one side were those who held this position in hostility to Christianity; on the other those to whom it

proved a point of transition to Christianity. But, then, the latter again, were exposed to a peculiar danger. Their earlier prejudices might re-act in such a way as to pervert their mode of apprehending and of shaping Christian truth. In this way much foreign matter, drawn from their previous opinions, might unconsciously be conveyed over with them to Christianity."—Church History, vol. i. p. 47.

GIESELER, writing of the second century, observes, "A speculative treatment of Christian doctrine was generally indispensable, if Christianity should be accessible to the philosophical culture of the times, and was rendered unavoidable by the measures of the Gnostics. It could only proceed from Platonism, which, of all philosophical systems, stood the nearest to Christianity. While many Platonic philosophers were brought over to Christianity by this internal relation, they received the latter as the most perfect philosophy, and retained with their philosophical mantle their philosophical turn of mind also." They set out with this assumption, "that the truth taught by Plato was derived from Moses and the prophets. Thus, then, they overvalued even the actual agreement of Plato with Christianity, and believed that they found many a Platonic idea in the latter, WHICH IN REALITY THEY THEMSELVES HAD FIRST INTRODUCED INTO IT."—Compend of Eccles. History, vol. i, p. 162.—Trans. Clark's For. Theol. Lib.—Note to Ham's Theological Tracts.

THE BLOOD IS THE SOUL.

BY ELD. E. R. PINNEY.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

1. "If the blood is the soul proper, was not Christ's soul left in sheol? for, he was quickened by the spirit?"

Ans.—It was not. It was taken by Jesus our High Priest into Heaven; for thus it is written (Murdock's translation is given because the idea is clearer rather, than in our version,) "But the Messiah who came, was a high priest of the good things which he wrought; and he entered into the great and perfect tabernacle, which was not made with hands, and was not made of these created things. And he did not enter with the blood of goats and calves: but with the blood of himself, he entered once into the sanctuary, and obtained eternal redemption * * * For the Messiah entered not into the sanctuary made with hands which is the emblem of the true (sanctuary): but he entered into HEAVEN ITSELF, to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. 9: 11, 12, 24. Read also verses 14 and 22.

Hence we see that his blood was not left in sheol, neither did it animate his resurrected body. Blood is too dense, too slow, and sluggish as a circulating medium in the bodies of the resurrected saints, who are to be equal in speed, power, &c., to the angels. Nothing but the pure *ruach* will answer for immortals. Consequently

Jesus the first fruits was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:" 1 Peter 3: 18. "Sown a *soulical* body, (i. e., a body animated by blood) but raised a *spiritual* body." 1 Cor 15: 44. For "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also QUICKEN YOUR MORTAL BODIES BY HIS SPIRIT that dwelleth in you." Romans 8: 11. All the saints at the resurrection therefore, are to be quickened by the same spirit that raised Jesus from the dead, as a medium of life to their bodies.

2. "If Christ's soul (*blood*) was not left in *sheol* (or *hades*) how can he *inherit* the kingdom of God? 1 Cor. 15: 50."

This objection is already answered above. The expression, "Flesh and blood," I understand to mean flesh animated by blood—i. e. corruptible—and so explained in the last clause of the verse, "Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Our inheritance is to be incorruptible; hence *we* must be incorruptible. Therefore all alive at Christ's coming will be changed "in the twinkling of an eye"—the circulating medium will be changed from *blood* to pure *Ruah*—from corruption to incorruption—from a *soulical* to a *spiritual* body. The same would have been effected by eating of the tree of life.

3. "If flesh and blood (the soul) cannot inherit the kingdom of God," as Paul saith, then the soul seems not redeemed; and hence must *in all cases* perish."

Ans.—Christ did not die to redeem men's souls, nor spirits, nor heads, or feet, but the whole man. *Men* are to be saved. Wherever soul is thus used it is synecdochically to represent the whole man. The whole man sinned—fell—died, and is to be redeemed. Amen.

4. "If the blood is the soul, and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, why should Paul wish it *preserved blameless* unto the coming of the Lord? 1 Thess. 5: 23."

Ans.—Because he wished the *entire* man preserved free from blame, or sin, for "without holiness," &c.; and the three terms, "body, soul, and spirit," only included the "*you*" in the first part of the sentence, and answered to the term "*wholly*" in the preceding sentence; and had he, like the Catholics in cursing, extended the enumeration to the head, feet, eyes, mouth, &c., even to the toe nails, he could have included no more than the "*you*" or "*thou*" representing the person.

5. "When God saith *my soul* loatheth them [Zach. 11: 8:] could it be His *blood* that he spoke of? And in the same verse when he said 'Their *soul* also abhorred me'—could he mean their *blood*?"

Ans.—The term *Nephesh* (soul) is a Hebraism for the reflexive pronouns I, me, my, thyself, himself, &c. The work, "Bible vs. Tradition" would have told you that, and you see Whiting, in his translation of *Nephesh*, very often renders it with reference to this fact. Then the passage would read, stripped of its figure, "I loath them, *they* also abhorred me." This answers your

6th objection, "Why am I cast down?" &c., and all similar passages.

7. "If the *soul*, proper, is the blood, then the soul being *corruptible*, were we not redeemed with a 'corruptible thing?' 1 Peter 1: 18."

Ans.—This objection is based upon a supposed contrast of corruptibility between silver and gold and blood, which is not a necessary implication. Murdock's translation removes, measurably, the obscurity—"Ye know, that neither with PERISHABLE silver, nor with gold, ye were redeemed * * * but with the *precious* blood of that Lamb in which is no spot," &c. The idea is that salvation could not be bought with money; and adds, that blood was the price, even the *precious* (not corruptible nor incorruptible, but '*precious*') blood of Christ. Why? Because "without shedding of blood there is no remission." And the blood of calves nor goats, nor men, nor angels would avail. It must be the only begotten Son of God, for "the altar sanctifieth the gift;" (Math 23: 19.) nor yet could he have satisfied the claims of the law without passing by the nature of angels and taking upon him "the seed of Abraham"—"part flesh and blood"—a "*soulical*" (or blood) body, which he received through Mary—hence, of necessity he must come not only by water, but by water and blood, so emphatically repeated by John—"This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by WATER and blood." 1 John 5: 6.

8. "Did Christ *actually* die by his blood being 'poured out?' Or, in other words, was it the *loss of blood* that caused his death? And if so, Did his blood go into his *grave*?"

Ans.—God says, the blood is the *Nephesh* (Gen. 9: 4.) Again, that "He (Christ) made his *Nephesh* an offering for sin"—"He *poured out* his *Nephesh* unto death." Isaiah 53: 10, 12. This is the Bible testimony. If Christ did not fulfil it, he is not the Saviour. His blood went into the grave (the earth) before his body did. I consider the earth the great charnel-house or grave of death. And a man goes into *sheol* whether you dig a hole in the ground, or in a rock above or below the ground—or raise a mound in any way above it, or sink him in the sea. Christ's blood went into the ground at the foot of the cross. "The wicked shall be turned into *sheol* with," &c. Psalms 9: 17; and they are to be devoured by fire, which is the second death. Rev. 20: 9; 21: 8. I do not see the distinction between Kever and Sheol that some would make.

"DIALOGUES ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT," by Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff, Scotland. This work is calculated to interest and instruct on the subject of immortality. Many of them have been circulated in this country. It is a 12 mo. pamphlet of 60 pages, and has been sold at 15 cents; but we have concluded to *reduce* the price to *ten* cents single; and \$6 per 100. We have just published a *new* edition.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW-YORK, FEBRUARY 1, 1854.

OUR OLD SUBSCRIBERS have more generally renewed than we had expected; and have done it, too, with a promptness that is truly gratifying; so that our list is considerably in advance of last year at this time; but we still lack about \$200 of enough to pay for paper, and the printer's bill, for our *semi-monthly* issue. Hence before the Editor can receive any compensation for his services, 200 more paying subscribers must be added. May that not be done at once? Will our patrons see if they cannot send at least *one* more subscriber *each*, immediately? If they can, and *all* do it, then the Examiner and its Editor will be provided for. This will enable him to give his time more entirely to the paper; and he trusts thereby to give a better one, than if his mind should be encumbered with exertions for sustenance for his "household;" for which if a man does "not provide" he has "denied the faith, and is *worse than an infidel*." So saith Paul, the apostle.

The effort is desirable at this time especially, as he must regulate, definitely, the number of papers to be printed at each issue, for the year.

"MATERIALISM."—Rev. Nathan George published nine articles in Zion's Herald, the Methodist Episcopal paper in Boston, in which he professed to "examine and refute the doctrines of George Storrs." In those articles, however, he says but little of our writings, but takes a pamphlet by Z. Campbell for examination. Nevertheless, we have thought best to give him a little attention for the sake of the truth. We will proceed with our dialogue commenced in the December Examiner. We should have been glad, as we have before said, if Br. George had commenced where we commenced, with the Mosaic account of creation, and shown that we were in error, and "anti-scriptural," in our views of the fact that man was created a *material* being; and then followed us—not Br. Campbell—in our argument to its conclusion, viz: that it is the will of God that no man shall have immortality, or endless life, except he forms a moral character in harmony with his Maker's. Thus "God formed *man* of the dust of the ground;" and having inspired him into consciousness, by the "*breath*, of life," He placed him under a *law* for the development of

a *moral character*—which man had not by creation, and could not have except by trial under a law. The Creator informed this man, that if he developed opposition to His will, or law, he should "*surely die*." This law implied, if the man developed a moral character in harmony with the divine will he should *not die*, but live forever, or have *Eternal Life*. The explanation of the penalty, by the Law-giver, shows that it was simply, "*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return*." Man should go back to that state from which his Creator brought him, and "be as though" he "had not been." That such was the determination of the Creator further appears from the fact, that after man sinned he was excluded from "the tree of life, lest he should take and eat thereof and live forever." There is no hint in any part of the whole transaction of an "immaterial" something in man which did not fall under the explained penalty of the law; the entire man was to be dissolved by death; so his Maker explained the matter; and it is for our opponents to disprove this position if they can. That Br. George could not do it, is sufficiently evident from the fact that he does not venture near the foundation, or root, of the question, but dashes off to some of the extreme branches; as though he thought, if some branch could be weakened the tree must fall. Why not take off his coat, and go at the root or trunk of the tree at once? Perhaps it was *too "material"*. Then, surely, he would not have had to "beat the air." Well, he has chosen his own way, and we will notice some of his sayings.

EXAMINER.—We hope, Br. George, you will not think us unkind for so long an introduction to our renewed conversation. We are not conscious of unkindness; and intend to love you none the less because you do not yet see as we do, that there is "no future life and immortality except through Jesus Christ alone; and that by a resurrection at the last day." What have you to say on Eccl. 9: 10—"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might: for there is no work, nor device, *nor knowledge*, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest?"

GEORGE.—"This affords no proof whatever that the soul dies with the body. We readily admit that all of man that goes into the grave retains none of these attributes named in the text, for the spirit of man does not go there, as the dust only returns "to the earth as it was," (Eccl. 12: 7.) Furthermore, we learn from the

Saviour that the soul does not die when the body is killed. (Matt. 10: 28.)"

EXR.—You are careful to conceal the fact that the term "*grave*," in this text is not *hever*, in the original, but *sheol*. It is not the term for grave, as now used in common conversation, but relates to the *state of man in death*; the "*covered*" state into which the *man* enters at death. Into this state "*the soul*" does go, as saith the Psalmist, Psalms 89: 48—"What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? shall he deliver his *soul* from the hand of the *grave*? Selah." *Mark this*, Br. George. In that state David, Solomon, and Hezekiah all affirm there is "*no knowledge*"—no praising God: and your *assumption* to the contrary finds no support in Eccl. 12: 7, unless Solomon contradicts himself, which is not likely. Your text, Matt. 10: 28, gives no countenance to the theory of the *conscious* existence of any part of man when he is dead. On that text, however, we refer you to an article in the Examiner, for January 15, by "Rev. J. Pantan Ham," England.

What have you to say on Romans 2: 7—"To them who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life?"

GEO.—"It is said that immortality is something to be sought for: but why seek it, if the soul is immortal? Immortality is the quality of never ceasing to exist, or exemption from death, and does not imply either happiness or misery. Now, as men seek only for that which they deem desirable, it cannot be merely existence that the apostle speaks of; but something to be desired in connection with that existence; hence, we may conclude with certainty that the word *blissful* added to it expresses the sense designed. This we think must be obvious to all."

EXR.—We thought you would find it necessary to "*add*" to the testimony of God; so, "*blissful*" comes to your aid. But this helps you not; for, you have defined "*immortality*" to be "*the quality of never ceasing to exist, or exemption from death.*" Now, the same apostle, in the same epistle, chap. 6: 23, saith, "*The wages of sin is death.*" Hence the wicked have not an "*exemption from death*," and therefore are not immortal, you being judge. But you say, "*immortality does not imply either happiness or misery.*" This is a pure *assumption*, without a particle of proof in the Bible, or in philosophy. Misery—so far as we have any knowledge—is, invariably, connected with *mortality* and corruptibility. Show us an immortal creature that suffers if you can. We believe the

thing is impossible—in the very nature of the case. Surely immortality—*deathlessness*—is something "*desirable*;" really worth *seeking for*. That state excludes all sorrow and pain; and hence implies the presence of all that is desirable. We do not need to add "*blissful*." It is blissful, indeed; and it is so because it is immortal, deathless, incorruptible; and it is gained only through Christ, the second Adam, and by a resurrection at the last day. "I will raise *him* up at the last day," saith Jesus, four times in one discourse, John 6th. Believe it, Br. G., and rejoice in the truth, that Life, Eternal Life—even immortality and incorruptibility—is "*the gift of God, through Jesus Christ*" to all "*them, who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for it.*"

MODERN DIVINITY.—A friend has sent us a sketch of a sermon preached in this city, at "Green-street Methodist Episcopal Church," by "*Rev. Dr. R. S. Foster*," the pastor. The sketch is cut from some newspaper report; and the sermon is said to have been a "*very impressive discourse.*" Text Matt. 16: 26, "What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul," &c. Dr. Foster is reported to have said—

"The word rendered '*soul*' in this text is rendered '*very life*' in many passages of the Scriptures, having no other significance than natural life. We are obliged, therefore, in many passages, to depend upon the context to find its meaning. In this text, however, it stands for the spirit—the latent principle that is within us all."

It is true the word rendered soul—*psucheen*—in this text, is rendered "*life*" in many passages," &c. Why does Dr. F. assume that here "*it*" stands for *spirit*?" He knows, or he is a misnamed Dr., that *pneuma* is the Greek term for *spirit*; and the two terms *psuche* and *pneuma* are never used interchangeably in the Scriptures; but are entirely distinct. His *assumption* is purely gratuitous, and without any authority except his mere *ipsi dixit*. Luke tells us distinctly, chap. 9: 25, that the thing *lost* is the man "*himself*;" hence, that "*life*" proper is the loss spoken of. The same word occurs four times in Matt. 16: 25, 26: *twice* rendered *life* and *twice* *soul*, the absurdity of which is manifest from Luke's version of the same discourse. Dr. Foster gives not one solitary text of Scripture—so far as the report goes—for his assumption. Again, Dr. Foster says—

"God intended, in the production of the human soul, that it should never die—that it should be endowed with immortal life—that its existence should be perpetual. The soul is never to die—never to cease to exist! It may die in the sense of being perverted, but not of perishing, so as to cease to be."

What "God intended" is one thing; and what will be the *actual result* is another, and may be a very different thing. This Dr. Foster must admit, or he lands in Universalism; for he says, in the next sentence, "God made it for the enjoyment of Himself, to live with Him forever." That is, "God intended" the soul to *enjoy Himself* forever. Will God's intention fail? will it be frustrated? Dr. F. and his associates in the belief of endless misery think, in this matter, God's intention may be frustrated. How then can they demonstrate—even if it be true that "God intended the human soul should never die"—that it will not die—yea, cease to exist? They cannot do it: they never have done it; and it is impossible for them ever to do it while the Scriptures abound in testimony that, "The soul that sinneth it *SHALL DIE*;" and "he that converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a *SOUL* from death." Ezk. 18: 4, 20, and James 5: 20. Not one text of Scripture has Dr. F. and his fellows in immortal-soulism in support of the bold assertion that "The soul is never to die—never to cease to exist," &c. Such assumptions contradict the testimony of the Spirit of God; and they are assuming a fearful responsibility who use them. Let them keep "to the law and the testimony;" remembering that if they "speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8: 20.

We tell these theologians once more, that unless they abandon their assumed premises, they are inevitably to be swept into restorationism with their flocks. The God dishonoring doctrine of endless sin and suffering will not bear the light: it is doomed to die: *it is too sick to live*. No wonder there are so many "*Doctors of Divinity*;" but the patient will die after all.

—♦♦♦—
"EAT HER FLESH AND BURN HER WITH FIRE."—So speaketh the voice of prophecy. Again, "The *waters* where the Harlot sitteth are *peoples*," &c., saith the same sure word: therefore, when the "*people*" are *withdrawn* from her, and the "*Scarlet colored Beast*" shall turn away from her support, then will vengeance fall upon her to the utmost. Let the following

be pondered, in view of the prophecy Rev. 17. It was sent in to a recent meeting of the "Republican Society" in this city. The writer, we judge, was well informed on the subject.

FEELING AT ROME.

NEW YORK, Monday, Jan. 9, 1854.

To Col. FORBES—*Dear Sir*: I can certainly have no objection to answer the question made in connection with my name at your last meeting, in which information was asked respecting the feelings of the Romans toward the Pope and his Government; though on the present occasion I am able to write but a few lines. Should I find time subsequently to convey at a greater length the impressions which I received through my contact with the Romans, the substance of my testimony would be to show that I regard Roman Catholicism as dead in Rome; nine-tenths of the people, including the female portion of the population, looking on the Pope and his Cardinals with contempt as spiritual impostors, and with the utmost hatred and horror as temporal oppressors.

From what I heard and saw I feel convinced, and am willing to place on record my conviction, that within twenty-four hours after the withdrawal of the foreign garrison the Pope's Government will have fallen, and his own life, together with those of his Cardinals and counsellors will have been sacrificed, unless they can save themselves by flight or concealment, which will be very difficult.

Every avenue of escape is noted and watched. The popular feeling of the Romans has been so embittered by the manifold executions, imprisonments, treacheries and oppressions of their rulers, that I regret to say I found the popular leaders inexorably deaf to any councils of moderation and mercy; deliberating merely whether the Holy Father should be hanged from the cross of St. Peter's, or over the so-called tomb of St. Peter within; the least violent stipulating only that he should be unfrocked as a false priest, and then tried like Charles 1st for violating his contract with and murdering his people.

I am, Dear Sir,

CHARLES FRED. HENNINGSSEN.

—♦♦♦—
A TROUBLE.—"I have a trouble about the identity of the *raised*. As you hold, it seems a new creation after the old type, and there could be two or ten thousand '*raised*' as properly from the same type and identity. Can you throw light on this troublesome (not to me alone) point?"

D. H. C.

The foregoing *trouble* makes us think of Nicodemus, who said, "How can these things be?" and of Paul's remark, "Some man will say, How are the *dead* raised up, and with what body do they [the dead] come?" Do such persons not "Err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God?" No man can have more than one "*identity*." That he must have in

the resurrection, or it is no resurrection at all. The word and truth of God are pledged to raise up the dead in Christ, "at the last day. Has God said it, and can He not do it?" Only admit His *omnipotence*, and be satisfied that He has promised it, and faith will find no fears left of being raised "ten thousand" instead of the same *one and identical person* who fell asleep. If our troubled friend wishes us to go into philosophical speculations on the matter, we must leave that to the disbelievers in God's power, who have supplied an immortal soul as an excuse for their unbelief.

—♦♦♦—
 "PROF. MAURICE" ONCE MORE.—Dr. Lees, Leeds, England, has sent us a scrap, cut we suppose from an English paper. It is headed "*The London Inquisition.*" It reads as follows:—

"The Principal and Council of King's College London, have just been making a sad spectacle of themselves. It seems that one of the Professors of the institution, a Rev. Mr. Maurice, had some critical notions about the Greek word *aiōnion*, which our translators of the Bible render "eternal;" and he took occasion to speak out his views respecting said word, in a lecture he recently delivered. This gave the alarm to the Principal, Dr. Jelf, who immediately wrote to the Professor, to explain whether he intended to question the orthodox doctrine of eternal punishment. The Professor replied that he believed in the eternal punishment of the wicked, in the New Testament sense of the phrase; but that he did not believe in it as some did; he thought that thousands of British youths under their instruction ought to have right conceptions of the matter; and hence he spoke out in the lecture. This was still more alarming to the pragmatical old Doctor, at the head of the heap, and so he convened the inquisition, *alias* the Collegiate Council, and they, by the aid of old Pope Jelf, excommunicated Professor Maurice from the College and delivered him over to Satan—the fate of all heretics. The Professor has appealed from this decision, alleging that his assumed judges had no jurisdiction in the case, inasmuch as he is accountable only to God and his ecclesiastical diocesan for his religious opinions, and not to his officers in the College.

Whether this appeal be right or wrong, we know not, having no access to the charter and constitution of the Seminary. But this we say, it is a bold and unwarranted step to take in these enlightened and tolerant times. Let us see, the Church of England, that it may hold all the fish coming to its net, opens its bosom wide enough to receive Calvinists, Arminians, Socinians, and the idolaters and image-worshippers of the corrupt Church of Rome. Ay, old Pusey himself may still fill the Hebrew chair in the highest University of the realm, even though

his heresy is rank, and smells to heaven, if not to hell. But Professor Maurice must be cut off, and sent a beggar upon the streets, because he doubts the unphilosophical fact, that brimstone and fire coming in contact will not at last burn out! It seems the Professor thinks with Bailey, the author of *Festus*, that the eternal punishment of the wicked will be their total destruction, wherein sin shall be destroyed; and by the power of Christ a new creation shall succeed, wherein shall "dwell righteousness;" and those who have once lived and been destroyed, shall be raised up in the new creation, and there shall be no more sin, or death, but "sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Whether the Professor's notions are right or wrong, is nothing to the point. If he is in error, he is in company with many others in the Church, whose speculative opinions are much more objectionable than his. We have known many very worthy and good men, who doubted that a benevolent Deity would make erring mortals eternally wretched, for a finite offence; and we do not think this sentiment an unworthy view of the attributes of a God of love.

But say it is an error; yet we protest against an old dogmatical bigot having the power to crucify unto death for such an error. This shows us what we have often seen and deplored, the sad condition of our seats of learning in this country, while under the thumb of narrow minded bigotted priests. Tell of having escaped from the intolerance and persecution of Rome!—it is all an empty boast, so long as such creatures as Dr. Jelf can ruin his professors, and send them to Coventry, for believing a little more or a little less than he does.

The foregoing is a just and merited rebuke of Dr. JELF; and may apply with equal propriety to all such as keep up the cry of "*infidelity*" against those, in this country, who maintain "Life and Immortality are only through Jesus Christ," and "all the wicked will He destroy." Whether PROF. MAURICE is with us, in this view, we have not been able yet to determine. One expression in the foregoing would seem to be in agreement with our view of the end of the wicked; but the following words appear to express a contrary idea, if they really convey the view of the PROFESSOR. The words we refer to are these, "Those who have once lived and been destroyed, shall be raised up in the new creation, and there shall be no more sin, or death." We find no Scripture authority for such a sentiment, and we are sure there is none. Till it shall appear, we pronounce it a mere fancy, from whomsoever it emanated. "If ye live after the flesh" [your animal nature; or, as mere animals] "*ye shall die.*" Romans 8: 11. Again, "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ

from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. 8: 11. If that Spirit does not dwell in us, we have no assurance of being *quicken'd to life*, after we have "*been destroyed*." Our life and immortality depends upon the Spirit of God dwelling in us, or there would be no reason for the apostle's "*if*." "The wages of sin is death." Romans 6: 23. When that death takes place which is the wages of sin—or, *personal transgression*, let any one show, if they can, that the subject of it, who has "*been destroyed*," will ever "*be raised up in the new creation*." In our opinion no such doctrine is found in the Bible. We hope we shall be able to get a clear idea of PROF. MAURICE'S belief, and that he may see, if he does not, that to men who follow their *animal* nature no other destiny is announced in Scripture than that of animals, *viz.* "*death*"—an irrevocable cessation of conscious being; they are "*as natural brute beasts * * ** and shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." 1 Peter 2: 12.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

OR, REMARKS ON MATTHEW 25: 46.

BY THE EDITOR.

"These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

This text is supposed by many to sustain the theory of the immortality of the human soul, and the endless misery of the wicked.

It is said—"If the everlasting *misery* of the wicked may come to an end, so may the everlasting *bliss* of the righteous, as the self same word is employed to express the *duration* of the *misery* of the one class as the *happiness* of the other."

We answer—The text saith not a word of the "*happiness*" of the one nor of the "*misery*" of the other. But if it did, it would avail nothing to the advocate of the common theory, unless he could prove the two classes equally undying, and immortal.

The term *aionion*—translated *eternal* and *everlasting*, in this text—does not, of itself, prove either the righteous or wicked would have a perpetual and unending existence, because it does not necessarily mean *without end*. This can easily be shown by its use, and the use of its corresponding word—*olom*—in Hebrew; which latter word occurs, in some of its forms, more than three hundred times in the Old Testament, and in a large majority of cases will be found to express a period, longer or shorter, that will have an end. Thus the Aaronical ministry is called an "*everlasting* priesthood:" the hills are called "*everlasting* hills."

Those who think, because the same term expressing duration is applied to both classes, in the text under consideration, it is made certain that the wicked will exist as long as the righteous, may be taught that they reason both inconclusively and dangerously. Take the following text, "*The everlasting God*," Isaiah 40: 25; and compare it with Heb. 3: 6, "*The everlasting mountains*." Shall the mountains continue as long as God? How will the advocates of unending misery evade the conclusion, on their premises, that the mountains will continue as long as God? Will they say, "We know the mountains will melt in the final conflagration?" True; and we know the wicked will be "*burned up*, and be left neither root nor branch," because, "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts:" Mal. 4: 1. But the Bible declares that God is "*the King immortal*:" not subject to be dissolved: while the everlasting mountains will be scattered and melted.

What is the argument, then, that the righteous are to continue in life while the wicked perish from life? It is not alone in the expression *everlasting*, or *eternal*, in the text; but in the fact that other texts assure us the righteous "*put on immortality, incorruption*," at the resurrection; 1 Cor. 15: and, saith Jesus, "Neither can they die any more:" Luke 20. Thus their perpetuity in life is settled by language that can have no other sense than that of unending life and being: while no such language occurs in relation to the wicked. On the contrary, they are to be "*consumed, devoured, burned up, be destroyed, utterly destroyed, soul and body*," &c. Such expressions, in the absence of any text affirming the immortality of wicked men, must settle the question, if testimony can settle any point.

The stumbling stone of our opposers is, in their assumption that protracted *pain* and *punishment* are necessarily identical. But this assumption is false in fact. What is the highest crime known in human law? It is murder. What is the punishment for that crime? Is it the most *protracted* pain? Or, is it the *deprivation of life*? It is the latter: and that is called the "*capital* punishment;" not because the criminal endures more pain, or as much as he might by some other; but because he is cut off from life.

If it be attempted to evade this point by saying—"The criminal feels horribly, while awaiting the day of execution,"—we ask, if his feelings are any part of the *penalty* of the law? Certainly not. They may be a *consequence* of his crime; but the law does not say he shall feel bad, but that *he shall die*. But, say the advocates of the common idea of *pain*, as essential to punishment, "there is the dreadful hereafter to the criminal." We reply, whatever may be hereafter to him, that is no part of the *penalty* of the law under which he dies. So the Judge understands it, who pronounces the death sentence; for he concludes by saying, "May God have mercy on your soul;" *i. e.*, "May

you not be hurt hereafter." Thus, turn which way our opposers may, they meet a two edged sword that hews in pieces their notion of protracted pain and punishment being necessarily identical.

In the text under consideration, the Saviour expresses the idea of punishment, without any necessary idea of protracted pain. The word here translated punishment is *kolasin*: and it is never used, on any other occasion, in any of our Lord's discourses, as recorded in the Bible. When he speaks of *torment*, as he often does in the Gospels and in Revelation, he most uniformly uses the word *basanois*, but never, *kolasin*. *kolasin* properly expresses punishment; and, strictly, the *kind* of punishment; as one meaning of the term is "*cut off*." The righteous enter into *life eternal*: the wicked are eternally *cut off* from life.

But we have an inspired Commentator on this declaration of our Lord; viz., Paul, the apostle. Whatever *scene* is described Matt. 25, and whatever *time* is spoken of, the same, in both respects, Paul speaks of 2 Thess. 1. They are both laid in one scene. Compare them together. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him." Matt. 25: 31. "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels." 2 Thess. 1: 7. Is here any mistake? Is not the scene the same in both texts? Is it possible to separate them? Again, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." Matt. 25: 46. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction." 2 Thess. 1: 9.

Here is no room to doubt but what Paul is speaking of the same punishment as Jesus; and the apostle declares the punishment is "*destruction*," not *preservation* under any circumstances; and the apostle tells us this destruction is "from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." This last expression may have the sense of "out of his presence," but we are inclined to believe it a reference to the consuming fire that sometimes came out from the presence of the Lord, under the law given by Moses; as for example, in Lev. 10: 1, 2.—"Nadab and Abihu, sons of Aaron, took either of them his censor, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not: and there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord." Or, take the case of those who, in the rebellion of Korah (Numb. 16: 35,) had taken their censors to appear before the Lord, "And there came out a fire from the Lord, and consumed the two hundred and fifty men that offered incense." Here was no *preservation*, but a being *consumed*, *devoured*; so that they "*died*." To this, most likely, Paul refers. The presence of Christ in his glory, with his holy angels, will so overpower and fill with terror the wicked, who behold him, that they will *die*—be *destroyed*—by the sight. If Daniel, Dan. 10th, and John, the beloved disciple, Rev. 1, both "*fell as dead*" at the sight of the glory mani-

festes to them, and recovered not till a hand was laid on them, with a voice saying "*fear not*," how then shall Christ's *enemies* live when he shall appear in glory? They cannot: they have cultivated such a disregard for Christ, and contempt of him, in his absence, that when he appears in his glory his presence will fill them with such fear as to destroy them forever. No hand is to be laid on them, nor voice heard, to soothe their fears; and they are "*utterly consumed with terror*." Their punishment is "*death—the wages of sin*;" and it is irrevocable—it is eternal. Thus Paul gives us a sure interpretation of Jesus' words, and enables us to speak with certainty as to the kind of punishment that is to be the portion of wicked men.

How death, from which there is no recovery, can be an eternal punishment, we will further illustrate. The highest punishment known in the law of God or man is *loss of life*, or death. The deprivation of life may be attended with pain or it may not. If it is, it is not the punishment; it is merely an accident attending the punishment. This truth is self-evident to the reflecting mind; because, however much the murderer might suffer in *dying*, that would not meet the claim of the law, or answer its penalty, unless his life is extinguished: he must "*be hung by the neck until he is dead*," saith the law.

If this man, when dead, could be restored to life in one year after, with the right to live, his punishment would be of only one year's duration. If a thousand years after, then it would have been of a thousand years duration: not of *pain*, but of *loss of life*. If he is never to be restored, but to remain eternally dead, then *how long* is his punishment? Is it not *eternal*, in the strictest sense? It is an eternal deprivation of life. Such is the Bible teaching in relation to the punishment of wicked men. And if we would live eternally we must come to Christ for that life. God has given to us eternal life, but that life is in His Son, and not in ourselves: See 1 John 5: 11, 12. It is the life-giving Spirit of God, bestowed on those, and those *only*, who come to Christ for it. This is that Spirit which raised up Christ from the dead, and by which, only, can any man be quickened to *immortality* and *incorruptibility*: (Rom. 8: 11, with 1 Cor. 15: 45, 54:) without it men perish—are destroyed—die, and "*shall be no more*." Psalms 104: 35. "Be as though they had not been;" Obadiah 16: "for the wages of sin is death;" Romans 6: 23; and, "all the wicked will God destroy;" Psalms 145: 20; yea, "They shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." Psalms 37: 20.

From the Christian Advocate and Journal.

IS PARADISE HEAVEN?

"It has occurred to my mind, while reading the account of Christ's suffering, death, resurrection, and ascension, that paradise is not

heaven, but the place where the departed spirits of the righteous remain (and are perfectly happy) until the resurrection. Christ said to the thief while upon the cross, 'This day thou shalt be with me in paradise.' And to Mary, after his resurrection, 'Touch me not; for I have not yet ascended to my Father.' And when he ascended, we are informed by St. Luke, 'That he led' his disciples 'out as far as to Bethany, and lifted up his hands and blessed them.' And it came to pass while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into *heaven*.' It appears that Christ's spirit was not in heaven those three days his body was in the tomb, *but in paradise*. And Mr. Wesley says, paradise means 'the place where the souls of the righteous remain from death till the resurrection.'

Now I wish to know if paradise is heaven ?

AN INQUIRER.

We believe the view of the above subject to which the 'Inquirer' has come is very generally sanctioned by the Christian Church.—ED. CH. ADVOCATE."

NOTE BY EDITOR OF EXAMINER.—If the above view is "sanctioned by the Christian Church," then it follows, that saints when they die do *not* go to be "*with Christ*;" for he has *left Paradise* and gone to *Heaven*. So the "Christian Church" is as far from getting dead saints to "the *golden hills*" as we are: only they keep them in a *half-way house*, *waiting* for the resurrection, and we let them "*sleep*" quietly, till that event.

FROM MRS. C — W —.

Hancock Co., Ohio, Jan. 8th, 1854.

Mr. G. Storrs,—Dear Sir:—In looking over the columns of the "Tribune" I was led to notice "The Bible Examiner;" and was much surprised to find my own opinions therein expressed so truly; as I was not aware there was any person in the world held such views except myself. And had I not found philosophy, reason, and revelation to sustain me, I might have doubted my senses. Because others believe as we do, adds nothing to the truth—but it encourages us to believe it is not all a delusion if others see the same thing. I have long been convinced that eternal life was the *free gift* of God in Jesus Christ: and unless through faith we are made the recipients of his Spirit we have no living principle within us.

However, this is but one link in a chain of truths, which compose the history of redeeming love, from which, not one link can be severed without destroying the whole. The Gospel is a perfect system, devised by infinite wisdom, to restore lost man to the moral image of God; and it is as susceptible of demonstration upon the principles of moral philosophy as any sys-

tem in nature. And it is much to be regretted that it should not be truly understood and more consistently preached.

It requires moral courage to avow a belief in opposition to long received opinions of men called *great* and good,—but in a matter of such unspeakable importance every one should think for themselves; and in this land of freedom every one has the right to say what they think, nevertheless I find there is almost an inquisition for thoughts. As I find you have embraced some important truths, I feel interested to learn your whole views with respect to man's salvation; and shall be much obliged if you will send me a pamphlet, or a number of the "semi-monthly;" and if I approve of it will become a subscriber—if not, will give you my reasons and compensate fully.

I fear you will think me intrusive, but in truth, sir, I feel conscientious about introducing any thing among my children and friends that is not calculated to make wise unto salvation. We have much already of no good, but of much evil, strewed in our paths as reading matter.

I feel much interested in your publication, and hope it is in every respect what it should be—a quickening, life-giving messenger to lost mankind.

NOTE BY EDITOR.—The foregoing is the result of an advertisement of the Bible Examiner we put into the New York Tribune. It manifests such a spirit that we cannot forbear giving it a place in our paper, but have suppressed the name of the writer lest she might not approve our inserting it. It is truly encouraging to learn, as we have in several instances by our advertisements, that there are persons whose views harmonize with ours on the *Life theme*, who have been unaware how widely these views have spread in Europe and in the United States. If our sister differs from us, on any point, we shall be glad to receive any light she may have beyond us. We have not the vanity to suppose there is not more light from the word than any of us have yet received.

FROM LESTER F. SIKES.

West Springfield, Mass.

Br. Storrs:—In reading Math. 11th: 2 to 6, we are informed of the doings of Jesus, as he sent word back to John, who was then in prison. Among his doings he declares that "the dead are raised." Upon the modern theory, what advantage could be derived, only in establishing His power, and perhaps His mission? The ruler's daughter, or the widow's son, I can see in no other light, without it was to heal and comfort those that mourn. Suppose they both went to heaven, as the sects say; I must say that they were called back from all the joy and happiness

that modern fancy can devise. If, on the other hand, hell had been their portion, it was their gain to come back, if they made their election sure before they again departed this life; and I am certain they would not let slip so great salvation, if they had had experimental knowledge respecting that awful state. In John 11, we read of the death of Lazarus. It appears that the family of this person was a stopping place of our Saviour. The sisters sent word to Jesus that their brother was sick, hoping he would come and heal him. Although he loved Lazarus, yet he delayed till he died. He tells his disciples it was for their sakes he died, that they might believe. Before his arrival he is met by Martha, who says, "if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." He had been dead four days. The sisters, with the other mourners, came and met Jesus; such were their feelings, that He also groaned and wept with them; and the remark was made, "how he loved him;" and after speaking of what Jesus had previously done, wanted to know, if even this man should have died, as he had healed so many. As they went to the grave, Martha said he had been dead so long that he had begun to decay; nevertheless, the glory of God was to be manifested; for they rolled away the stone from it, and, soon after, Jesus called Lazarus to come forth. He obeyed, and came forth in his grave clothes.

Now, to look at it in modern light, we see him who was beloved, gone to heaven four days previous, called back to the joy of his friends. What must have been his thoughts of the exchange? Well might Jesus have "wept" to call back, to undergo more of the troubles of mortality, one who had gone safely to heaven! How was the glory of God seen in this view? One whom he loved, to be tried and tempted, merely to stop a few mourning tears! In heaven all is safe; no fear of taking his life there. Yet Lazarus' life was sought, after being raised, by the Jews. Truly might Jesus weep, to think what Lazarus had got to suffer for the glory of God! To be sought after as a wild beast, that his life might be taken. These views, how revolting! Truly, I feel thankful I can see and believe, with the ancient, and the few modern believers, that Jesus is what he says, "I am the resurrection and the life." I hope that may be our portion—even eternal life.

FROM J. WENDELL.

Edinboro, Penn. Jan'y 18, 1854.

Br. Storrs:—The light of "life, only through Christ," is spreading in these parts, though not without opposition. The other evening I preached on the subject, and, after I closed, a Methodist minister arose and spoke in defence of their "traditions," and closed by saying, we made man like the beast. I remarked, in reply, that we did not make man like the beast, but God declares he is so; and then quoted Eccl. 3: 18, 20; Ps. 49: 20. Thus, while God declares man to be "like the beasts that perish," you correct the

Almighty, and say, man is *like God*. Where is your authority? Where your proof from the Bible? I admit you have, in the Bible, one proof text for your position, and only one, viz.: Gen. 3: 4, 5. But I reject your witness; he stands impeached by all the other witnesses, as well as by direct testimony, that he is a liar from the beginning. The discussion lasted till near midnight. I then told him I should be happy to meet him at any time, and discuss the question, but he would not agree to meet me. It has created quite an interest, and I am invited in every direction to come and preach the word of life—all new places. I have been here but a few weeks, and the traveling has been bad—no sleighing nor wagoning; consequently, I have remained near home; but the prospect seems fair for doing good, by the blessing of God, which I pray may rest upon all our efforts. Amen.

THE TRUE WESLEYAN says, "We did no wrong. We do not repent. We never refused an exchange (with the Bible Examiner) but thought The True Wesleyan went regularly until otherwise informed last week."

Thank you, Br. Wesleyan. Right glad you did not intend to 'sight us; and we cheerfully correct the insinuation of your sin and "repentance," contained in the Examiner. We thank you, also, for the very pretty "JUVENILE INSTRUCTOR" that now accompanies the Wesleyan. It is a neat quarto of four pages, published every other week, at 25 cents, or five copies for \$1, by *Lucius C. Mattack*, at Syracuse, N. Y.

"THE WORLD'S CRISIS," is the name of a paper just started at Lowell, Mass., without price. Its object is to scatter the views of those who believe the Second Advent of Christ will occur *this year*. We have no confidence whatever in the grounds of their calculations in the matter; but we intend to have no strife about it: a few weeks will test the truth of their theory; and as most of those concerned are sincere and honest men, we trust they will be preserved from all excesses.

"THE SECOND ADVENT WATCHMAN," published at Hartford, Conn., and edited by ELDER JOSEPH TURNER—who was with us in defence of the Bible last June, in the "Bible Convention"—is published weekly, at \$2 per year. The paper is a neat quarto of eight pages. Though not agreeing with its Editor in all his theological views, we sincerely hope he may be sustained, and that the Watchman will not be permitted to go down by the desertion of those who have shared so liberally the use of its columns.

It has nobly maintained the views on Life and Death advocated in the Examiner. It is a free medium, also, on all the general views relating to the Second Advent of Christ. The *time* of that advent has been largely discussed in it the past few months; and many have been heard in defence of the view that it will occur in 1854. The Editor dissents from them, though he has said but little, compared with its advocates. We are sorry that they should think of *abandoning* the Watchman to start a *new* paper *exclusively* in their views. We hope they will rally to the support of the Watchman.

BRAIN AND THOUGHT.—Richmond mentions the case of a woman whose brain was exposed in consequence of the removal of a considerable portion of its bony covering by disease. He says he repeatedly made pressure on the brain, and each time suspended all feeling and all intellect, which were instantly restored when the pressure was withdrawn. The same writer also relates another case, that of a man who had been trepanned, and who perceived his intellectual faculties failing, and his existence drawing to a close, every time the efused blood collected upon the brain so as to produce pressure. Professor Chapman, of Philadelphia, mentions, in his Lectures, that he saw an individual with his skull perforated and the brain exposed, who was accustomed to submit himself to the same experiment of pressure as the above, and who was exhibited by the late Professor Westar to his class. His intellect and moral faculties disappeared on the application of pressure to the brain; they were held under the thumb, as it were, and restored at pleasure to their full activity by discontinuing the pressure. But the most extraordinary case of this kind within my knowledge, and one peculiarly interesting to the physiologist and metaphysician, is related by Sir Astley Cooper in his Surgical Lectures. A man, by the name of Jones, received an injury of his head while on board a vessel in the Mediterranean, which rendered him insensible. The vessel, soon after this, made Gibraltar, where Jones was placed in the hospital, and remained several months in the same insensible state. He was then carried on board the Dolphin frigate to Deptford, and from thence was sent to St. Thomas's Hospital, London. He lay constantly on his back, and breathed with difficulty. His pulse was regular, and each time it beat he moved his fingers. When hungry or thirsty he moved his lips and tongue. Mr. Clyne, the surgeon, found a portion of the skull depressed, trepanned him, and removed the depressed portion. Immediately after this operation the motion of the fingers ceased, and at four o'clock in the afternoon (the operation having been performed at one) he sat up in bed; sensation and volition returned, and in four days he got out of bed and conversed. The last thing he remembered was the circumstance of taking a prize in the Medi-

terranean. From the moment of the accident, *thirteen months and a few days*, oblivion had come over him, and all recollection ceased. He had, for more than one year, drunk of the cup of Lethe, and lived wholly unconscious of existence: yet, on removing a small portion of bone which pressed upon the brain, he was restored to the full possession of the powers of his mind and body.—*Dr. Brigham.*

REAPING LIFE AND CORRUPTION.—Gal. vi. 8: "He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption." The term *corruption*, in Greek and English, has two significations, moral depravity and putrefaction. In the present instance, the first of these meanings cannot be intended by the apostle, for it will offer no congruous sense to say, He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap *depravity*. The term, therefore, in this place, signifies *putrefaction*, as the concomitant of death: literal destruction. Thus the same word is used, Rom. viii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50; Col. ii. 22; 2 Pet. ii. 12. The whole verse will then present a forcible and intelligible statement. "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap *life everlasting*."—*White's Life in Christ.*

IMMORTALITY AND DEATH.—Rom. ii. 6, 7: "God will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, honour, and immortality, eternal life." Chap. vi. 23: "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." In these passages, *Immortality* and *Death* are declared to be the respective destinies of the righteous and the wicked; and it is apparently conveyed in the strongest possible manner, that "immortality" is the "gift of God" to the godly alone.—*Ibid.*

BIBLE VS. TRADITION.—This work is a thorough cure for the natural immortality theory; and shows beyond a reasonable doubt that Life and Immortality are the gift of God through Jesus Christ *alone*, and by the resurrection at the last day. Price, 75 cents. For \$5, ten copies. Sent in all cases at the expense of the purchaser, except where \$1 is sent for one copy, and the two double Examiners containing Ham's Works, then we pay the postage.

PREACHING IN NEW YORK, every Sunday, at *Mechanic's Hall*, 472 Broadway, above Grand St., by H. L. Hastings, Editor of the Examiner, and occasionally by others. The *Life Theme* is made *prominent* in this meeting. Friends in the city, and from the country, visiting the city, are invited to meet with us. *Seats free.*